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#### Part 1 is the criticism. Attempts at universal ethics fail when confronted with class nature. Other universal ethical frameworks ignore inequality produced by class-based societies. Llorente 03

Renzo Llorente. “Maurice Cornforth’s Contribution to Marxist Metaethics.” NATURE, SOCIETY, AND THOUGHT Vol. 16, No. 3 (2003). <http://homepages.spa.umn.edu/~marquit/nst163a.pdf>

Let me begin with what is undoubtedly the central feature of Cornforth’s critique of analytic moral philosophy in Marxism and the Linguistic Philosophy (and a basic component of what I have called a Marxist metaethics), namely his insistence on the inherent injustice of attempting to universalize ethical norms in class-divided societies. Before reviewing the substance and scope of Cornforth’s criticism, however, it will be helpful to say a word about the principle of universalizability and its importance in ethics.In moral philosophy, or ethics (for our present purposes we may use the two terms synonymously), we say that a judgment is universalizable if, to quote R. M. Hare, “it logically commits the speaker to making a similar judgment about anything which is either exactly like the subject of the original judgment or like it in the relevant respects” (1963, 139, cited in Cornforth 1965, 214).8 Put more simply, this [a] principle holds that “what is right (or wrong) for one person is right (or wrong) for any similar person in similar circumstances” (Singer 1999, 941); the mere fact that individuals differ from one another—as opposed to finding themselves in situations that are dissimilar (or being themselves dissimilar) in a morally relevant sense9—in and of itself never justifies the application of different moral standards or the imposition of different moral duties. Universal applicability is, according to this thesis, a formal feature of all moral principles, indeed, a necessary condition for any proposition or judgment to qualify as a moral principle. While the basic intuition reflected in this criterion was first explicitly developed by Immanuel Kant, we owe the stron- gest modern statement and elucidation of this principle to R. M. Hare, who is for this reason—and because of his stature as one of the leading figures in twentieth-century analytical moral philoso- phy—the main target of Cornforth’s criticism in the pages devoted to ethics within Marxism and the Linguistic Philosophy.Cornforth does not take exception to the principle of universalizability as such. To the contrary, he, like the great majority of contemporary philosophers, acknowledges its validity, noting that it “is a consequence of the essentially social nature of morality. . . . [I]t is simply the result of the fact that such are enunciated for the purpose of regulating social life” (1965, 235). The problem, argues Cornforth, concerns the contradiction between a demand for, and injunction to, universalizability as the guarantee of fairness and impartiality, on the one hand, and the inherent injustice and unfairness of seeking to universalize moral norms and precepts in class-divided societies. For the insistence on universalizability, save in a situation of rough equality of condition, imposes very different burdens on the agents subject to this demand, and thus proves inherently unfair, a violation of the fundamental moral precept, already formulated by Aristotle, of equality of treatment for equals.10 As Cornforth puts it, “How, in a class-divided society in which the profits of one class are derived from the labour of another, can public policies and social aims be judged by a criterion of universal acceptability?” (228). Or again, putting the same point a bit differently (i.e., in terms of interests): “Until all exploitation of man by man is ended, morality cannot be based on a generalised human standpoint, expressing a common human point of view and interest” (357). We shall return to Cornforth’s remarks on interests shortly. Before doing so, let us first consider Cornforth’s discussion of the consequences attending the attempt to comply with the imperative of universalizability in class-divided societies. As Cornforth shows, two outcomes are possible. On the one hand, insofar as determinate moral principles are established as universally valid and used to regulate social life, the result is the enshrinement of a system of moral rules that is intrinsically unfair and inevitably class-biased. As Cornforth observes, “Where there are class divisions and one class interest is dominant within the given form of association, the corresponding obligations and rights express the dominant class interest, and the corresponding moral code becomes class-biased, not a code of universal but of class-biased morality” (1965, 354).11 In other words, if class divisions preclude the rough equality of condition necessary for the principle of universalizability to function properly (i.e., impartially), then the prevailing moral code will normally comprise duties, obligations, and so on that favor the dominant classes,12 since their interests are sure to take precedence in a situation in which there exist divergent, mutually exclusive interests and they alone possess the economic and political resources to ensure that their interests prevail.13

#### Particular facts are irrelevant without totalizing historical theory—methodological inquiry is prior to action, meaning my framework comes first.

Lukács ’67 György Lukács, History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics, trans. Rodney Livingstone, MIT Press: Cambridge, 1967, p. 7-10 jss

Thus we perceive that there is something highly problematic in the fact that capitalist society is predisposed to harmonise with scientific method, to constitute indeed the social premises of its exactness. If the internal structure of the 'facts' of their interconnections is essentially historical, if, that is to say, they are [and] caught up in a process of continuous transformation, then we may indeed question when the greater scientific inaccuracy occurs. It is when I conceive of the 'facts' as existing in a form and as subject to laws concerning which I have a methodological certainty (or at least probability) that they no longer apply to these facts? Or is it when I consciously take this situation into account, cast a critical eye at the 'exactitude' attainable by such a method and concentrate instead on those points where this historical aspect, this decisive fact of change really manifests itself? The historical character of the 'facts' which science seems to have grasped with such 'purity' makes itself felt in an even more devastating manner. As the products of historical evolution they are involved in continuous change. But in addition they are also precisely in their objective structure the products of a definite historical epoch, **namely** capitalism. Thus when 'science' maintains that the manner in which data immediately present themselves is an adequate foundation of scientific conceptualisation and that the actual form of these data is the appropriate starting point for the formation of scientific concepts, it thereby takes its stand simply and dogmatically on the basis of capitalist society. It uncritically accepts the nature of the object as it is given and the laws of that society as the unalterable foundation of 'science'. In order to progress from these 'facts' to facts in the true meaning of the word it is necessary to perceive their historical conditioning as such and to abandon the point of view that would see them as immediately given: they must themselves be subjected to a historical and dialectical examination. For as Marx says:8 "The finished pattern of economic relations as seen on the surface in their real existence and consequently in the ideas with which the agents and bearers of these relations seek to understand them, is very different from, and indeed quite the reverse of and antagonistic to their inner, essential but concealed core and the concepts corresponding to it." If the facts are to be understood, this distinction between their real existence and their inner core must be grasped clearly and precisely. This distinction is the first premise of a truly scientific study which in Marx's words, "would be superfluous if the outward appearance of things coincided with their essence" .10 Thus we must detach the phenomena from the form in which they are immediately given and discover the intervening links which connect them to their core, their essence. In so doing, we shall arrive at an understanding of their apparent form and see it as the form in which the inner core necessarily appears. It is necessary because of the historical character of the facts, because they have grown in the soil of capitalist society. This twofold character, the simultaneous recognition and transcendence of immediate appearances is precisely the dialectical nexus. In this respect, superficial readers imprisoned in the modes of thought created by capitalism, experienced the gravest difficulties in comprehending the structure of thought in Capital. For on the one hand, Marx's account pushes the capitalist nature of all economic forms to their furthest limits, he creates an intellectual milieu where they can exist in their purest form by positing a society 'corresponding to the theory', i.e. capitalist through and through, consisting of none but capitalists and proletarians. But conversely, no sooner does this strategy produce results, no sooner does this world of phenomena seem to be on the point of crystallising out into theory than it dissolves into a mere illusion, a distorted situation appears as in a distorting mirror which is, however, "only the conscious expression of an imaginary movement". Only in this context which sees the isolated facts of social life as aspects of the historical process and integrates them in a totality, can knowledge of the facts hope to become knowledge of reality. This knowledge starts from the simple (and to the capitalist world), pure, immediate, natural determinants described above. It progresses from them to the knowledge of the concrete totality, i.e. to the conceptual reproduction of reality. This concrete totality is by no means an unmediated datum for thought. "The concrete is concrete," Marx says,11 "because it is a synthesis of many particular determinants, i.e. a unity of diverse elements." Idealism succumbs here to the delusion of confusing the intellectual reproduction of reality with the actual structure of reality itself. For "in thought, reality appears as the process of synthesis, not as starting-point, but as outcome, although it is the real starting-point and hence the starting-point for perception and ideas." Conversely, the vulgar materialists, even in the modem guise donned by Bernstein and others, do not go beyond the reproduction of the immediate, simple determinants of social life. They imagine that they are being quite extraordinarily 'exact' when they simply take over these determinants without either analysing them further or welding them into a concrete totality. They take the facts in abstract isolation, explaining them only in terms of abstract laws unrelated to the concrete totality. As Marx observes: "Crudeness and conceptual nullity consist in the tendency to forge arbitrary unmediated connections between things that belong together in an organic union." 12 The crudeness and conceptual nullity of such thought lies primarily in the fact that it obscures the historical, transitory nature of capitalist society. Its determinants take on the appearance of timeless, eternal categories valid for all social formations. This could be seen at its crassest in the vulgar bourgeois economists, but the vulgar Marxists soon followed in their footsteps. The dialectical method was overthrown and with it the methodological supremacy of the totality over the individual aspects; the parts were prevented from finding their definition within the whole and, instead, the whole was dismissed as unscientific or else it degenerated into the mere 'idea' or 'sum' of the parts. With the totality out of the way, the fetishistic relations of the isolated parts appeared as a timeless law valid for every human society. Marx's dictum: "The relations of production of every society form a whole" 13 is the methodological point of departure and the key to the historical understanding of social relations. All the isolated partial categories can be thought of and treated-in isolation-as something that is always present in every society. (If it cannot be found in a given society this is put down to 'chance as the exception that proves the rule.) But the changes to which these individual aspects are subject give no clear and unambiguous picture of the real differences in the various stages of the evolution of society. These can really only be discerned in the context of the total historical process of their relation to society as a whole.

#### Part 2 is the plan. Text: Just governments should ensure a living wage as a price ceiling. This means, whatever the living wage is, all workers may at max make that. Jette 14.

Dr Matt Jette (PhD Harvard in Political Science), “Mobility and Walmart” December 2014

This past September President Obama called on Congress to increase in the minimum wage. From 1938 to today the amount has increased from a mere $.25 an hour to $7.25 an hour. Based more on social and political reasons and less on economic rationality, the minimum wage is designed to provide workers with a type of living wage. Although the minimum wage is seen by economists as a classic example of a price floor, thereby creating a surplus, here I will argue that perhaps it is best seen as a price ceiling. Briefly, a price set above the natural market equilibrium is simply defined as a price ceiling. An inefficiency then occurs in the market and shortages ensue due to an increase demand for the restricted good supplied. As such, a system must be created to determine who gets the supply of goods. Normal discussions focus on the wage earner and hence the correct definition of the minimum wage would consequently be defined as a price floor. However, borrowing from Marx’s “labor value of labor,” a more accurate discussion, better yet investigation, should focus perhaps on the jobs these minimum wage earners currently occupy. If we flip the discussion as such, then the minimum wage serves as the cost “of” the job (or more precisely, the market value of the work needed to complete the job), hence a price ceiling. If the minimum wage is set at [floor of] $7.25 an hour to perform job A (i.e., price floor), then the work needed to perform job A is set at $7.25. This occurs regardless of what knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) are needed to perform a job. The shortage results not in the number of workers, but in the number of jobs available. A potential side effect discussed in economic modeling is a black market. In this case a black market is not created; rather, what results is a more sophisticated system to determine who gets job A, which naturally leads to the further cementing of the American worker dependence of and in the market place.

I will accept all definitions the neg wants me to defend as long as they allow me to affirm. Also, force neg t interps on living wage to be unique to the aff because I still defend living wage as a price floor. The only nuance is I also defend it as a price ceiling—it is simultaneously both. Creating a wage ceiling at the level necessary to live comfortably best rejects these capitalistic powers and ensures equality.

#### My world equalizes the socio-economic plane. Not only does this affirm because there is no capitalistic machine to exercise power over the masses, but there are tons of benefits to reducing this inequality. Scanlon 14

T. M. Scanlon is Alford Professor of Natural Religion, Moral Philosophy, and Civil Polity at Harvard University. h<ttp://ideas.ted.com/2014/06/03/the-4-biggest-r>easons-why-inequality-is-bad-for-society/

Economic inequality can give wealthier people an unacceptable degree of control over the lives of others. [1.] If wealth is very unevenly distributed in a society, wealthy people often end up in control of many aspects of the lives of poorer citizens: over where and how they can work, what they can buy, and in general what their lives will be like. As an example, ownership of a public media outlet, such as a newspaper or a television channel, can give control over how others in the society view themselves and their lives, and how they understand their society. 2. Economic inequality can undermine the fairness of political institutions. If those who hold political offices must depend on large contributions for their campaigns, they will be more responsive to the interests and demands of wealthy contributors, and those who are not rich will not be fairly represented. 3. Economic inequality undermines the fairness of the economic system itself. Economic inequality makes it difficult, if not impossible, to create equality of opportunity. Income inequality means that some children will enter the workforce much better prepared than others. And people with few assets find it harder to access the first small steps to larger opportunities, such as a loan to start a business or pay for an advanced degree. None of these objections is an expression of mere envy. They are objections to inequality based on the effects of some being much better off than others. In principle, these effects could avoided, without reducing economic inequality, through such means as the public financing of political campaigns and making high-quality public education available to all children (however difficult this would be in practice). A fourth kind of objection to inequality is more direct. In [Paul Krugman’s review of Capital in the 21st Century](http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2014/may/08/thomas-piketty-new-gilded-age/) by Thomas Piketty, he mentions [these stats](http://www.epi.org/publication/ib347-earnings-top-one-percent-rebound-strongly/) from the US Bureau of Labor Statistics: “[4.] Real wages for most U.S. workers have increased little if at all since the early 1970s, but wages for the top 1 percent of earners have risen 165 percent, and wages for the top 0.1 percent have risen 362 percent.” (Krugman calls those “supersalaries.”) Again, the idea that this is objectionable is not mere envy. It rests, I believe, on this idea, my fourth point: 4. [but] Workers, as participants in a scheme of cooperation that produces national income, have a claim to a fair share of what they have helped to produce. What constitutes a fair share is of course controversial. One answer is provided by John Rawls’ [Difference Principle](http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/justice-distributive/#Difference), according to which inequalities in wealth and income are permissible if and only if these inequalities could not be reduced without worsening the position of those who are worst-off. You don’t have to accept this exact principle, though, in order to believe that if an economy is producing an increasing level of goods and services, then all those who participate in producing these benefits — workers as well as others — should share in the result. Peter Singer’s powerful argument for altruistic giving draws on one moral relation we can stand in to others: the relation of being able to benefit them in some important way. With respect to this relation, to “matter morally” is to be someone whose welfare there is reason to increase. But the objections to inequality that I have listed rest on a different moral relation. It’s the relation between individuals who are participants in a cooperative scheme. Those who are related to us in this way matter morally in a further sense: they are fellow participants to whom the terms of our cooperation must be justifiable. In our current environment of growing inequality, can such a justification be given? No one has reason to accept a scheme of cooperation that places their lives under the control of others, that deprives them of meaningful political participation, that deprives their children of the opportunity to qualify for better jobs, and that deprives them of a share in the wealth they help to produce. These are not just objections to inequality and its consequences: they are at the same time challenges to the legitimacy of the system itself. The holdings of the rich are not legitimate if they are acquired through competition from which others are excluded, and made possible by laws that are shaped by the rich for the benefit of the rich. In these ways, economic inequality can undermine the conditions of its own legitimacy.

#### Part 3 is the framework. The role of the ballot is challenging capitalism in educational debate spaces

Kovel 2, Professor of Social Studies at Bard

(Joel, The Enemy of Nature, p. 224)

Relentless criticism can delegitimize the system and release people into struggle. And as struggle develops, victories that are no more than incremental by their own terms- stopping a meeting stopping the IMF, the hopes stirred forth by a campaign such as Ralph Nader’s in 2000 – can have a symbolic effect far greater than their external result, and constitute points of rupture with capital. This rupture is not a set of facts added to our knowledge of the world, but a change in our relation to the world. Its effects are dynamic, not incremental, and like all genuine insights it changes the balance of forces and can propagate very swiftly. Thus the release from inertia can trigger a rapid cascade of changes, so that it could be said that the forces pressing towards radical change need not be linear and incremental, but can be exponential in character. In this way, conscientious and radical criticism of the given, even in advance of having blueprints for an alternative, can be a material force, because it can seize the mind of the masses of people. There is no greater responsibility for intellectuals.

#### Capitalism causes dehumanization, disposability, inequality, and inevitable crises. The role of the ballot is challenging capitalism in educational spaces

Pope Francis 13 – pope of the Catholic Church

(Pope Francis. “Evangelii Gaudium.” <http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/apost_exhortations/documents/papa-francesco_esortazione-ap_20131124_evangelii-gaudium.html>)

51. It is not the task of the Pope to offer a detailed and complete analysis of contemporary reality, but I do exhort all the communities to an “ever watchful scrutiny of the signs of the times”.[54] This is in fact a grave responsibility, since certain present realities, unless effectively dealt with, are capable of setting off processes of dehumanization which would then be hard to reverse. We need to distinguish clearly what might be a fruit of the kingdom from what runs counter to God’s plan. This involves not only recognizing and discerning spirits, but also – and this is decisive – choosing movements of the spirit of good and rejecting those of the spirit of evil. I take for granted the different analyses which other documents of the universal magisterium have offered, as well as those proposed by the regional and national conferences of bishops. In this Exhortation I claim only to consider briefly, and from a pastoral perspective, certain factors which can restrain or weaken the impulse of missionary renewal in the Church, either because they threaten the life and dignity of God’s people or because they affect those who are directly involved in the Church’s institutions and in her work of evangelization. I. Some challenges of today’s world 52. In our time humanity is experiencing a turning-point in its history, as we can see from the advances being made in so many fields. We can only praise the steps being taken to improve people’s welfare in areas such as health care, education and communications. At the same time we have to remember that the majority of our contemporaries are barely living from day to day, with dire consequences. A number of diseases are spreading. The hearts of many people are gripped by fear and desperation, even in the so-called rich countries. The joy of living frequently fades, lack of respect for others and violence are on the rise, and inequality is increasingly evident. It is a struggle to live and, often, to live with precious little dignity. This epochal change has been set in motion by the enormous qualitative, quantitative, rapid and cumulative advances occuring in the sciences and in technology, and by their instant application in different areas of nature and of life. We are in an age of knowledge and information, which has led to new and often anonymous kinds of power. No to an economy of exclusion 53. Just as the commandment “Thou shalt not kill” sets a clear limit in order to safeguard the value of human life, today we also have to say “thou shalt not” to an economy of exclusion and inequality. Such an economy kills. How can it be that it is not a news item when an elderly homeless person dies of exposure, but it is news when the stock market loses two points? This is a case of exclusion. Can we continue to stand by when food is thrown away while people are starving? This is a case of inequality. Today everything comes under the laws of competition and the survival of the fittest, where the powerful feed upon the powerless. As a consequence, masses of people find themselves excluded and marginalized: without work, without possibilities, without any means of escape. Human beings are themselves considered consumer goods to be used and then discarded. We have created a “throw away” culture which is now spreading. It is no longer simply about exploitation and oppression, but something new. Exclusion ultimately has to do with what it means to be a part of the society in which we live; those excluded are no longer society’s underside or its fringes or its disenfranchised – they are no longer even a part of it. The excluded are not the “exploited” but the outcast, the “leftovers”. 54. In this context, some people continue to defend trickle-down theories which assume that economic growth, encouraged by a free market, will inevitably succeed in bringing about greater justice and inclusiveness in the world. This opinion, which has never been confirmed by the facts, expresses a crude and naïve trust in the goodness of those wielding economic power and in the sacralized workings of the prevailing economic system. Meanwhile, the excluded are still waiting. To sustain a lifestyle which excludes others, or to sustain enthusiasm for that selfish ideal, a globalization of indifference has developed. Almost without being aware of it, we end up being incapable of feeling compassion at the outcry of the poor, weeping for other people’s pain, and feeling a need to help them, as though all this were someone else’s responsibility and not our own. The culture of prosperity deadens us; we are thrilled if the market offers us something new to purchase. In the meantime all those lives stunted for lack of opportunity seem a mere spectacle; they fail to move us. No to the new idolatry of money 55. One cause of this situation is found in our relationship with money, since we calmly accept its dominion over ourselves and our societies. The current financial crisis can make us overlook the fact that it originated in a profound human crisis: the denial of the primacy of the human person! We have created new idols. The worship of the ancient golden calf (cf. Ex 32:1-35) has returned in a new and ruthless guise in the idolatry of money and the dictatorship of an impersonal economy lacking a truly human purpose. The worldwide crisis affecting finance and the economy lays bare their imbalances and, above all, their lack of real concern for human beings; man is reduced to one of his needs alone: consumption. 56. While the earnings of a minority are growing exponentially, so too is the gap separating the majority from the prosperity enjoyed by those happy few. This imbalance is the result of ideologies which defend the absolute autonomy of the marketplace and financial speculation. Consequently, they reject the right of states, charged with vigilance for the common good, to exercise any form of control. A new tyranny is thus born, invisible and often virtual, which unilaterally and relentlessly imposes its own laws and rules. Debt and the accumulation of interest also make it difficult for countries to realize the potential of their own economies and keep citizens from enjoying their real purchasing power. To all this we can add widespread corruption and self-serving tax evasion, which have taken on worldwide dimensions. The thirst for power and possessions knows no limits. In this system, which tends to devour everything which stands in the way of increased profits, whatever is fragile, like the environment, is defenseless before the interests of a deified market, which become the only rule. No to a financial system which rules rather than serves 57. Behind this attitude lurks a rejection of ethics and a rejection of God. Ethics has come to be viewed with a certain scornful derision. It is seen as counterproductive, too human, because it makes money and power relative. It is felt to be a threat, since it condemns the manipulation and debasement of the person. In effect, ethics leads to a God who calls for a committed response which is outside the categories of the marketplace. When these latter are absolutized, God can only be seen as uncontrollable, unmanageable, even dangerous, since he calls human beings to their full realization and to freedom from all forms of enslavement. Ethics – a non-ideological ethics – would make it possible to bring about balance and a more humane social order. With this in mind, I encourage financial experts and political leaders to ponder the words of one of the sages of antiquity: “Not to share one’s wealth with the poor is to steal from them and to take away their livelihood. It is not our own goods which we hold, but theirs”.[55] 58. A financial reform open to such ethical considerations would require a vigorous change of approach on the part of political leaders. I urge them to face this challenge with determination and an eye to the future, while not ignoring, of course, the specifics of each case. Money must serve, not rule! The Pope loves everyone, rich and poor alike, but he is obliged in the name of Christ to remind all that the rich must help, respect and promote the poor. I exhort you to generous solidarity and to the return of economics and finance to an ethical approach which favours human beings. No to the inequality which spawns violence 59. Today in many places we hear a call for greater security. But until exclusion and inequality in society and between peoples are reversed, it will be impossible to eliminate violence. The poor and the poorer peoples are accused of violence, yet without equal opportunities the different forms of aggression and conflict will find a fertile terrain for growth and eventually explode. When a society – whether local, national or global – is willing to leave a part of itself on the fringes, no political programmes or resources spent on law enforcement or surveillance systems can indefinitely guarantee tranquility. This is not the case simply because inequality provokes a violent reaction from those excluded from the system, but because the socioeconomic system is unjust at its root. Just as goodness tends to spread, the toleration of evil, which is injustice, tends to expand its baneful influence and quietly to undermine any political and social system, no matter how solid it may appear. If every action has its consequences, an evil embedded in the structures of a society has a constant potential for disintegration and death. It is evil crystallized in unjust social structures, which cannot be the basis of hope for a better future. We are far from the so-called “end of history”, since the conditions for a sustainable and peaceful development have not yet been adequately articulated and realized.

#### Capitalism reduces everything to market abstractions—negates value to life and makes extinction inevitable

Kovel 2 (Joel, Professor of Social Studies at Bard , “The Enemy of Nature,” p140-141)

The precondition of an ecologically rational attitude toward nature is the recognition that nature far surpasses us and has its own intrinsic value, irreducible to our practice. Thus we achieve differentiation from nature. It is in this light that we would approach the question of transforming practice ecologically — or, as we now recognize to be the same thing, dialectically. The monster that now bestrides the world was born of the conjugation of value and dominated labor. From the former arose the quantification of reality, and, with this, the loss of the differentiated recognition essential for ecosystemic integrity; from the latter emerged a kind of selfhood that could swim in these icy waters. From this standpoint one might call capitalism a ‘regime of the ego’, meaning that under its auspices a kind of estranged self emerges as the mode of capital’s reproduction. This self is not merely prideful the ordinary connotation of ‘egotistical’ — more fully, it is the ensemble of those relations that embody the domination of nature from one side, and, from the other, ensure the reproduction of capital. This ego is the latest version of the purified male principle, emerging aeons after the initial gendered domination became absorbed and rationalized as profitability and self-maximization (allowing suitable ‘power-women’ to join the dance). It is a pure culture of splitting and non-recognition: of itself, of the otherness of nature and of the nature of others. In terms of the preceding discussion, it is the elevation of the merely individual and isolated mind-as-ego into a reigning principle. ‘~ Capital produces egoic relations, which reproduce capital. The isolated selves of the capitalist order can choose to become personifications of capital, or may have the role thrust upon them. In either case, they embark upon a pattern of non-recognition mandated by the fact that the almighty dollar interposes itself between all elements of experience: all things in the world, all other persons, and between the self and its world: nothing really exists except in and through monetization. This set-up provides an ideal culture medium for the bacillus of competition and ruthless self-maximization. Because money is all that ‘counts’, a peculiar heartlessness characterizes capitalists, a tough-minded and cold abstraction that will sacrifice species, whole continents (viz. Africa) or inconvenient sub-sets of the population (viz. black urban males) who add too little to the great march of surplus value or may be seen as standing in its way. The presence of value screens out genuine fellow-feeling or compassion, replacing it with the calculus of profit-expansion. Never has a holocaust been carried out so impersonally.

# Theory Underview

1. Presume Aff in the absence of offense

A) Rebuttal 4-6-3 time skew means it’s harder to affirm because the 1ar has to cover a 7 min speech and preempt a 6 minute rebuttal which will go for the most undercovered layer

B) Empirically confirmed by a 7% neg win bias pretty much everywhere

2. My AC is fair, so don’t vote on T or theory, three warrants

A) Predictability—this case is literally posted on the wiki and it’s all I’ve read on this topic, it’s totally predictable to think I’ll run this

B) Ground—even if neg loses some generic DA ground, there still are a whole bunch of easy turns neg can make like communism bad or I make it worse. Plus my AC is probably K nirvana

C) Topic Lit—don’t let him think for a second my AC isn’t in the topic lit—cap is not only a huge part of any lit, but specifically to this resolution about wages and labor! Plus Jette proves there are at least some experts who believe this

3. Don’t vote on norm setting or potential abuse

A) Empirically denied as people read contradictory theory arguments all the time. Many people read RVI or no RVI depending on which side of the theory debate they're on. So double bind- either a) norms don't exist and are just a disingenuous tool used by debaters, or b) norms can exist but are too weak to be followed

B) No solvency - nobody is likely to care about one individual round, or even hear about it in the first place. There are thousands of rounds on any given topic, so at best the impact is mooted.

C) Every argument is potentially abusive in its extremes. And because it’s always to neg’s advantage to claim abuse, if the punishment for actual and potential abuse are the same, the purpose of theory to act as a check is destroyed

4. Defending implementation ignores the predicates in the resolution and is not textual. Nebel:

http://vbriefly.com/2014/12/19/jake-nebel-on-specifying-just-governments/

I believe that debaters shouldn’t specify a government on the living wage topic. The standard argument for this is simple: “just governments” is a plural noun phrase, so it refers to more than one just government. Most debaters will stop there. But there is much more to say. (Some seem not to care about the plural construction. I plan to address this view in a later article about the parametric conception of topicality.) Some noun phrases include articles like “the,” demonstratives like “these,” possessives like “my,” or quantifiers like “some” or “all.” These words are called determiners. Bare plurals, including “just governments,” lack determiners. There’s no article, demonstrative, possessive, or quantifier in front of the noun to tell you how many or which governments are being discussed. We use bare plurals for two main purposes. Consider some examples: Debaters are here. Debaters are smart. In (1), “debaters” seems equivalent to “some debaters.” It is true just in case there is more than one debater around. If I enter a restaurant and utter (1), I speak truly if there are a couple of debaters at a table. This is an *existential* use of the bare plural, because it just says that there exist things of the relevant class (debaters) that meet the relevant description (being here). In (2), though, “debaters” seems to refer to debaters in general. This use of the bare plural is *generic*. Some say that generics refer to kinds of things, rather than particular members of their kinds, or that they refer to typical cases. There is a large literature on understanding generics. Here my aim is not to figure out the truth conditions for the generic reading of the resolution; I shall simply work with our pre-theoretical grip on the contrast between sentences like (1) and (2). This distinction bears importantly on the resolution. If “just governments” is a generic bare plural, then the debate is about whether just governments in general ought to require that employers pay a living wage. If it is an existential bare plural, then the debate is about whether some just governments—i.e., more than one—ought to require that employers pay a living wage. Only the second interpretation allows one to affirm by specifying a few governments. To my ear, the generic reading is correct. I think the best evidence for this is simply the undistorted judgments of ordinary speakers. No competent speaker of English would, without distorting influence or additional evidence of generalizability, endorse an inference from a plan involving two just governments to the resolution. Suppose Sally, an American citizen, believes that the U.S. and Canada should require employers to pay a living wage, but that no other government (just or unjust, actual or possible) should. She would not represent her view by asserting, “Just governments ought to require that employers pay a living wage.” She would deny this claim and hold that the U.S. and Canada are exceptions. One might object that Sally would endorse this assertion if she believed that the U.S. and Canada are the only just governments. Maybe she would, but that is explained by the generic reading, because she would then be making a generalization about (what she believes to be) just governments. And the onus would be on the affirmative, when specifying particular governments, to add such a premise. Moreover, many linguists would add that Sally could not regard it is as mere accident that these governments are just and that they ought to require employers to pay a living wage: the resolution requires there to be some explanatory connection between the justness of governments and the living wage requirement (see Carlson 2005). This is good evidence because ordinary speakers have an implicit (but not infallible) mastery over the language in which the resolution is stated. The resolution is stated in English, not in some special debate-specific dialect of English. Facts of usage constrain interpretation. The existential interpretation is not even, as I see it, eligible. So its pragmatic benefits are irrelevant. Compare: I think it would be better if the resolution were, “It is not the case that just governments ought to …” But that’s not the resolution, so it’s not even an eligible interpretation in a T debate. (Here I assume a controversial view about whether pragmatic benefits can justify a semantically inadequate interpretation of the resolution. I cannot defend this view here, but I welcome questions and objections in the comments to be addressed in a later article.)

End quote. Text comes first on theory because the most fair or educational way to debate is constrained by the context of the topic we are given. This also means it’s the largest link into pre-round predictability, which is key to fairness because it ensures both debaters have an equal opportunity to debate the resolution at hand. And, text is a prime facie voter on jurisdiction because you couldn’t vote for an AC that only talks about the Red Sox.

# Neg ground

1. No abuse—we don’t have this in the status quo, so obviously there’s ground or else we’d be doing it.
2. No abuse—we live in America which is one of the most anti-communist countries in the world. My AC literally advocates communism, if he can’t answer that, that’s on him.

# A2 T

A2 Salary distinction 1. We can do that too 2. No distinction 3. Wage = lowest, the first we have to look for

T—employers

A2: 1. Turn : move past by disassociating word w/ cap meaning 2. Employers will exist anyway as a mark of a complex society 3. Not relevant under AIMs

LW = price ceiling

Jette

I meet whole rez tooo. Will also defend LW as PF

# 1AR ADD ON

Winning parr is an extinction link, which you should evaluate first on the framework debate. Schell[[1]](#footnote-1) argues:

~~Up to now, every risk has been contained within the frame of life;~~ extinction ~~would shatter the frame. It~~ represents not the defeat of some purpose but an abyss in which all human purposes would be drowned for all time. We have no right to place the possibility of this limitless, eternal defeat on the same footing as risks that we run in the ordinary conduct of our affairs in our particular transient moment of human history~~. To employ a mathematical analogy, we can say that although the risk of extinction may be fractional, the stake is, humanly speaking, infinite, and a fraction of infinity is still infinity.~~ In other words, ~~once we learn that a holocaust might lead to extinction~~ we have no right to gamble, because if we lose, the game will be over, and neither we nor anyone else will ever get another chance.

End quote. This means that Parr functions an independent framework argument, regardless of how the min-archy vs util framework plays out.

# ROB

### Prefer ROB

1) Capitalism is a more fundamental determinant of how individuals act and how attitudes are shaped in the squo. Thus questioning capitalism is more likely to solve the implications of the squo.

2) Resistance of capitalist production is more likely to be useful and applicable to our lives- the structures of capitalism are everywhere, interacting with us all the time

3) Any link we get to the aff is a disad to a framework that prioritizes investigation of rhetoric over capitalist trends

## Discourse Outweighs Fairness

### Topshelf

#### The impacts of being discursively harmful outweigh the impacts of being unfair, so if I win that my opponent’s discourse should be rejected, then I should win the debate, irrespective of theory issues.

#### Magnitude.

#### Fiat is illusionary. The hypothetical aff and neg worlds will never actually exist. Issues of fairness only concern how we structure a thought experiment about the comparative desirability of two hypothetical worlds that won’t actually exist. Issues of discourse concern real world issues that can actually affect us as people beyond the illusion of fiat.

#### Debaters are the academics, lawyers, and politicians of the future. Debaters will go on to lead important and influential lives. It is important that debaters be instilled with a sense of respect for others because they are the ones who will actually shape the policies of the future, and whose lives will affect people all over the country.

#### Scope. Fairness only affects one debater in the round. The discursive implications of our arguments affect people both in and out of the debate round, since they function on a pre-fiat level. Specifically, my arguments about how my opponent is speaking on behalf of people whose social position (s)he does not understand indicates that [his/her] discourse could affect all of those people.

#### Reversibility. Debaters can win rounds that have been skewed against them if they are talented and hardworking enough. Debaters whose opponents have promoted a harmful form of discourse in the debate round can only compensate by criticizing the discourse and asking that it be rejected. There is no way to reverse the harm that has been caused by the discourse other than to condemn the person who did it and create an incentive for it to not happen again.

#### Duration. The unfairness of a debate position stops being relevant once the 2AR is over. The discursive impacts of our arguments can affect people long after the round is over, particularly if there are no steps taken to condemn the harmful discourse and discourage it from being used again.

#### Even if they win that fairness is more important than discourse, then prefer discursive impacts over theory impacts because discursive impacts are fairer.

#### Reciprocity. If I claim my opponent’s discourse is harmful, they can impact turn or link turn my arguments on discourse and win the debate. Discursive impacts are 100% reciprocal, while theory impacts are only sufficient for the person who starts the theory debate.

#### Time. I have to spend time reading a separate counter-interp and then winning the RVI, which exacerbates neg time skew, especially since the 2NR can just dump on the RVI. They can impact turn or link turn my discourse impacts which requires less time investment. So, prefer discursive impacts because they are more fair than evaluating a theory debate.

#### This argument functions on a meta-theoretical level. Weighing at the standards level doesn’t make sense because I am indicting the use of theory as an issue of fairness. They would need to justify why they should be able to initiate a theory debate in the first place before we weigh theoretical objections. So, I will argue that discourse comes first, but even if they win that theory comes first, they still need to justify why reading theory is fair in the first place.

### AT: Fairness Controls the I/L to Education

#### This is not responsive at all. I am not saying their arguments are uneducational. I am saying that they are promoting a discourse that has real world negative impacts and that they should be punished for it. Their arguments might be educational, but they are still harmful.

#### Begging the question. They need to justify why their arguments are educationally good, or else there is no reason to vote for their arguments because they control the internal link to some educational impact that isn’t justified in the first place.

### AT: No bright-line to discourse

#### We can just weigh the quality of discourse, just like we can weigh fairness at the standards level. They could have impact turned my discourse impacts or indicted the discourse that I was using. Bright-lines don’t matter for fairness or discourse because both are weighable.

### AT: People will leave the activity if it’s unfair

#### People are not going to leave the activity. It’s too much fun and it’s addicting. My opponent is probably going to lose this round, and (s)he’s probably going to shake it off and keep on debating. The risk of a link to the impact is zero.

#### My weighing analysis on magnitude and scope comes first. Even if everyone leaves debate, then that just means that there will be less harmful discourse in the world, which is probably a good thing.

1. Jonathan Schell The Fate of the Earth, p.95

   http://debate.uvm.edu/Library/DebateTheoryLibrary/Roskoski-Infinite%20Risk [↑](#footnote-ref-1)